

THE  
JUDGMENT  
OF THE  
*Church of* ENGLAND

In the Case of  
LAY-BAPTISM  
AND OF  
Dissenters Baptism.

---

---

L O N D O N :

Sold by *A. Baldwin* near the *Oxford-Arms* in  
*Warwick-Lane.* 1712.

Price Six-Pence.

714  
14

JUDGMENT

OF THE

COURT OF COMMONS

IN THE CASE OF

M 211



115 M

AND

Directors' Report

\_\_\_\_\_

FOR THE YEAR 1870-71  
PRINTED BY THE DIRECTOR  
AT THE BRITISH MUSEUM  
LONDON



## *Preface to the Reader.*

THE Author of a Book, whose Title is, *The Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*— having found 1st, That no one could validly baptize, but he who is commissioned by Christ to do it; and, 2dly, That no one is commissioned by Christ to do it, but he who is *Episcopally ordained*; and, 3dly, That the Man who baptized him, was not *Episcopally ordain'd*, but a *Dissenting Teacher*: This Author, I say, tells us very fairly, that he procured himself to be baptized by an Episcopal Minister. And Dr. *Hicks*, in a long Letter to the Author, prefix'd to this Book, thus compliments his great Performance, P. 12. ' It is against the Authority of the pretended Ministers of this [*Presbyterian*] Mission, *who were never duely authorized*, and therefore cannot administer *truly valid Baptism*, that you have written your *excellent Book*, with great Strength and Perspicuity, as well as Modesty, and confirmed your *Doctrine* with your *Practice*. *i. e.* he had been rebaptized.

As I knew this could not *regularly and lawfully* be done by any *Parish Priest* of the Church of *England*, without acquainting the *Bishop* of the Diocese therewith, as the *Rubric* commands, it being a new, and (as I take it) an extraordinary Case; so finding it to have been *actually* done, I concluded with my self, that the

## P R E F A C E.

Bishop had been consulted with, and had given way to the solemn *rebaptizing* an adult Person, who had before been baptized by one of the *Presbyterian Ordination*, in or with *Water*, and in the *Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*. It did not at all become me, nor was I concern'd, to inquire, which of the Bishops it was, that gave way to, nor who the Presbyter was that perform'd, this new Work : But I set my self in great Earnest to consider what the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *England* was in this Case. Could I have trusted either the Doctor or his *Friend*, I needed to have gone no farther than this little Book ; for there I found they were, both of them, very fully perswaded, that the Church of *England* does absolutely *nullify* and *invalidate* all Baptism conferr'd by any one who is not Episcopally ordain'd ; and consequently, requires all such as have not been baptized by Episcopal Hands, to be *rebaptized*, since Baptism is held necessary by her, where it can be had. But having seriously considered the *Offices of Baptism*, and the *Rubrics*, and compared them with the subsequent *Practice* of the Episcopal Ministers, I could not find these two Writers had convincingly proved what they intended. And not thinking my self, at present, concern'd in the main Matter disputed, *viz.* Whether Lay-Baptism be invalid, or whether all the Presbyterian Ministers are meer Lay-men, but only to know what the Opinion of the Church of *England* was in the Matter ; I have, in the following Papers, only taken Notice of what these two Writers alledge, as from the Church  
of

## P R E F A C E.

of *England*, in Favour of their Point: Leaving the rest of the Book to be considered by others, who are at Leisure, and think it worth their while. I wondred indeed, that none of the *Church of England-Clergy*, had taken any Notice of this Book, and the Doctrine endeavoured to be propagated by it, especially the Parish-Priests of *London*; for if this Doctrine be true, I dare engage there is not one of them but has a considerable Number of his Parishioners, who are not baptized, nor consequently *Christians*, and yet have lived in constant Communion with him, and have frequently received the Sacrament of *the Lord's Supper*, at his Hands; which thing ought not to have been done, if they are not *Christians*.

He must, at this Rate, look to all the People who are upwards of 50 Years of Age; for 'tis twenty to one, but that they who were baptized before the Year 1660, were baptized by *Dissenting Teachers*, and are consequently not baptized at all. He must also place all such as have left the *Separation* since 1660, and come over to the *Church*, of what Age soever, in the Rank of *Unbaptized*, because 'tis most likely they were baptized by *Dissenting Teachers*. Nay he must look to many who were baptized by *Church of England Ministers*: For some of them were the Children of *Dissenters*, and baptized by *Dissenters*, and tho' they afterwards took Orders of the *Church of England*, yet not having been *validly* baptized themselves, they could not *validly* baptize others; for their being Ministers of the *Church of England* did not make them *Christians*;



## P R E F A C E.

*stians*; their *Ordinations* did not give them *true Baptism*, if they had it not before. What Work is here for a *London Minister*! and yet I averr that every Word of it, is, and must be true, if Dissenting Ministers Baptism be invalid, according to the Doctrine of Dr. *Hicks*, and his *Friend*: And yet, I profess seriously, that tho' I am acquainted with many of these excellent Persons, and have often been at their Churches, yet did I never hear one of them tell his People, that if they had not been baptized by an Episcopal Minister, they must be baptized again, for *they were not Christians*.

For the Sake of these Consequences, I say, I wondred not a little that the Church-Clergy had not taken some Notice of these Doctrines, which are *written, printed, preached, and recommended* in Publick. They will, I assure them, when they grow to any Head, give them more Trouble, than they now seem to be aware of. But it may be they are frightened by what the Doctor says in his *Letter*, P. 17. ‘ In the same Place, Sir, you say you hope that none *vested with this Divine Authority*, will fight against it, &c. which if any Clergy-man should do in the Manner you there mention (*i. e.* appearing publicly in Opposition to the Subject of this Essay, of the *Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, P. 120.) I could not but suspect that he was one of those, who took Gifts, and Presents of the *Dissenters*, to let the Names of their Children, who had no other but *Schismatical Lay-Baptisms*, be registered among the true Baptisms of the Church: or at least of another Sort, who to court the

Favour

## P R E F A C E.

‘ Favour and Applause of the *Dissenters*, either  
‘ never preach in Defence of the Church against  
‘ *Them*; or if they do, they do it no otherwise  
‘ than barely to shew, that the Church of Eng-  
‘ land is a *safe Communion*, and that those who  
‘ through Mistake separated from it, would be  
‘ in no Danger of *Damnation*, if they returned  
‘ to it. But to shew that Separation from it is  
‘ *Schism*, and by Consequence a *damning Sin*;  
‘ and that the Separatists of all Sorts from it,  
‘ are, without the extraordinary Mercy of God,  
‘ in great and apparent Danger of *Damnation*;  
‘ these Gentlemen love not to touch upon that  
‘ Point, nor rise to that Height. It was, I sup-  
‘ pose, a Reflection upon these Men, and the  
‘ Indignation he had against their double Prac-  
‘ tices, which provoked a *Divine* [Dr. Birch]  
‘ not very many Years since, to utter a *Sarcasm*  
‘ upon them, from the Pulpit, in Words to  
‘ this Purpose, *That some* (at the Time he spoke  
‘ it) *were become Fathers of the Church, who ne-*  
‘ *ver were her true Sons.*

I have transcribed this Passage more at large  
than I needed to have done, on purpose to  
gratify the Doctor, who was so pleased with it,  
that I think he went a little out of his way,  
to fetch it in; and I am afraid he has made the  
*silly and uncharitable Sarcasm*, his own, by his  
Allowance of it. I have ventured to put down  
the Name of that *Divine*, that People may  
know what Value to set upon that *Sarcasm*.  
He was himself born and bred a *Dissenter* (and  
therefore the Doctor will not know well what  
to say of his Baptism) and was brought over to  
the

## P R E F A C E.

the Church of *England*, by the Care and good Pains taken with him, by that most excellent Bishop of *Oxford*, Dr. *Fell*: But he (as the way of weak and warm Heads is) did not know where to stop. I say no more, because the Man is dead; and should hardly have said this, had not the Party, principally aimed at by the Indignation of that poor *Divine*, been Doctor *Tillotson* the Arch-bishop of *Canterbury*, whose Name will live for ever, increasing in Esteem with all good and wise Men, when a Thousand of his pittyful Detracters, shall soon be quite forgotten, or be remembred for a score or two of Years, only for some poor, peevish, and unchristian *Sayings*.

But must it indeed be so, that if a Clergy-man of the Church of *England*, should write against *this notable Essay*, he must be one of these two sorts of Clergy-men, whom the Doctor represents in such an odious Manner, that I hope there are not above Twenty such in the whole Kingdom? Cannot a Clergy-man, who sees and dreads the Consequences such a Doctrine will draw after it, endeavour to perswade his Friends that such a Doctrine is not true, and try to prove it false by the best Arguments he can, without being ranked in the Number of such as deserve the *Pillory* and *Deprivation*? P. 18. Cannot an honest Clergy-man defend the *Validity*, tho' not the *Regularity* and *Lawfulness* of Baptism, administred by Dissenting Teachers, without being false to his sacred Trust, if he believe himself warranted so to do, by Scripture, and Authority of the Church-Practice, both Antient and Modern? Must a Clergy-man magnify



## P R E F A C E.

magnify his Office, at the Expence of Truth and Charity? Or is he obliged to suffer, patiently and silently, the *unchristianizing* not only so many Hundred Thousands of his own Country-men, Friends, Acquaintance, and near Relations, but all the *Protestants* that are, and have been, for almost two hundred Years, throughout the World, as were not, and only because they were not, so happy as to be baptized by Men Episcopally Ordained? Is he, I say, obliged to suffer this, and hold his Tongue, rather than by his speaking, to diminish the Sacredness of his own *Divine Authority*, and to encourage such as *Separate*, to go on in their own way? I put the worst of the Case, as these People will suppose it may be; and yet no wise and learned Clergy-man, will find himself restrained, from opposing what he accounts a mischievous Error, and defending what he thinks an useful Truth, for fear of such Consequences as he knows he does not *design*, and knows they are not *Necessary*, nor will *follow* with People that can consider soberly, and reason justly. But we are fallen, God help us, into Times, when to be a good *Church-man*, means nothing less than *living up to her Doctrine, conforming to her Rules and Orders, communicating constantly with her in Prayers and Sacraments*: But it means, the being loud and contentious in the Church's Quarrel; the being exceeding mad against all that are not like minded with us; the talking furiously for her Authority; and the decrying every thing that looks like Moderation and good Temper towards such as differ from us. And therefore  
whilst

## P R E F A C E.

whilst this Ferment lasts, whilst the Nation is under this Inchantment, this strong unnatural Violence, and the Suspension, as it were, of Reason, and calm Deliberation, I will cease to wonder, that some of the Clergy of the Church of *England*, appear not against a Doctrine, that, if it be true, has peopled Hell with many Millions. I will, I say, cease to wonder for a while; because I know not whether Reason, Judgment, Learning, Perspicuity, and all the Qualities that a good Writer ought to have, would signify much, if once the Word were given out, among the *Holy Brother-hood*, that such a Book was written *against* (what they are pleased to call) *the Church*. And, indeed, this Argument is so strong, that I my self am forced to submit to it. As free as I am from any of the aforesaid Restraints, under which the Clergy lie; as little as I have to hope for, or to fear, on secular Accounts; yet do I not dare to own my self, the Writer of this Paper, by setting my Name before it. The Design I have, is as good as the Heart of Man can frame: The Cause I plead for is that of *the Church of England*, of which I ever was, and am, and ever shall be, by the Grace of God, a very faithful and sincere Member; and I am, I think, retained in this good Cause, by Justice and great Charity; and I believe I have maintained it well, and like an honest and a reasonable Man: But yet I own, the Dread of drawing down the Indignation of the Church-Rabble upon me, is so great, that I will not have it so much as whispered, where I live, nor of what Profession I am. My  
Reasons

## P R E F A C E.

Reasons and my Arguments have so far favoured the *Dissenters*, that (whatever my Intentions were) they have proved them to be *Christians*, in the Opinion of *the Church of England*; and that I perceive will not go well down, nor be digested well (the more is the pity) by abundance of Smatterers, and young Students in Divinity, who would give more Credit to Doctor *H.* in this Case, recommending a Layman's Treatise, that condemns them all, than to a hundred other Lay-Mens Treatises, endeavouring to make them Christians, tho' they should come into the World, with the Approbation of *the Majority of the Bishops*. And this is another Cause of my Concealment, because I have no Heart to engage with such a wrathful Generation.

And here I put my Pen into the Inkhorn, and fell into a strong and deep Amusement, revolving in my Mind, with great Perplexity, the amazing Change of our Affairs, both Civil and Religious, within the Compass of two Years! And whilst I was going, from the Fulness of my Heart, to utter strange things, I was as it were awakened and relieved, by the Visit of an old Acquaintance, that in his Time, had been considerable in *Doctors-Commons*. To him, after the usual Salutations past, I could not forbear reading (such was our Friendship) this *Preface*, as far as I had gone in it— Upon which, after a little Pause, he replied, in his grave Manner, to this Purpose; ‘ Your Zeal, I find, has rais’d you a little above your usual Temper : I know not, till you shew me, what Arguments



## P R E F A C E.

ments you have made use of, to prove the  
Dissenters to be *Christians*; but I can furnish  
you with one, if it has scaped your Memory,  
from *Doctors-Commens*: And that is, that all the  
Prosecutions, Excommunications, Fines and Penalties,  
that the Dissenters have undergone from  
the Days of *Old Elizabeth*, to the present  
Times, are so many Proofs of the Church of  
England's owning them to be *Christians*: For  
the Court-Christian has nothing to do with any  
one but *Christians*. And it would be a  
great Absurdity to excommunicate a Person that  
had no Right to *Church-Communion*; and he  
who is not baptized, has certainly no Right to  
*Church-Communion*.

Here my good Friend ended; and so will I,  
when I have desired the Reader to place this,  
as a *fourth Proof* of my Position (which I think  
is a very sensible one, and next to *Demonstration*)  
and when I have adjured the *Dissenters*,  
as I heartily do, both Teachers and People, by  
all that is dear and valuable to them, to fulfil  
my Joy, in coming, and returning, to the Com-  
munion of the Church of *England*; That I may  
not only say I have proved them to be *Christians*,  
but that they are in this, and all other good Re-  
spects, not only almost, but altogether as I am,  
sincere and constantly-conforming Members of  
her.

9 N063

T H E

THE  
JUDGMENT  
OF THE  
Church of *ENGLAND*  
In the Case of  
*LAY-BAPTISM*  
AND OF  
DISSENTERS BAPTISM.

The General Position is,  
That the Church of England hath, by no Publick  
Act of hers, made or declared Lay-Baptism to be  
invalid.

**T**HIS will appear from the first Book I.  
of *Common-Prayer*, which was finish- Proof  
ed and confirmed by Act of Parlia-  
ment in the 2. and 3. *Edward VI.* in  
1548, and printed in 1549, of which Book the *Act*  
says, — *That it was, by the Aid of the Holy Ghost,*  
*with uniform Agreement, concluded by the Compilers.*  
And from the second Book of *Common-Prayer*  
put out in the 5. and 6. *Edward VI.* in 1552.

In these two Books, in the Office of *Private*  
*Baptism*, the Rubrics are, — *Let them that be pre-*  
*sent, call upon God for his Grace, and say the Lords-*  
*Prayer, if the Time will suffer. And then ONE of*  
*them*

*them shall name the Child, and dip him in the Water, or pour the Water upon him, saying these Words,—* N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

1. Book.

*To the Intent the Priest may examine and try whether the Child be lawfully baptized or no —* he is to ask these Questions of those who bring the aforesaid Child to Church.

1. ‘ *By whom* was this Child baptized ?
2. ‘ *Who was present* when the Child was baptized ?
3. ‘ *Whether they called upon God for Grace, and Succour, in that Necessity ?*
4. ‘ *With what thing or matter* did they baptize the Child ?
5. ‘ *With what Words* the Child was baptized ?
6. ‘ *Whether they think the Child to be lawfully and perfectly baptized ?*

These things are in the 1st and 2d Books of *Edward VI.*

Now the Answer to the *first Question*, might well have been in *Edward VI's Days*— *John Lawrence* the Uncle ; or *Jane Lawrence* the Midwife, or *George Hays* a Neighbour and Gentleman. Because in Cases of Necessity, the Baptism of Lay-men was allowed to be used in the Days of Popery ; and *Midwives* were expressly ordered to be taught the Form of Baptizing, in Latin. And it does not appear that the *first Reformers* changed this Practice. The *first Rubric* does, without any Strain or Violence, suppose the Child to be baptized by a Lay-*Person*.

The



The Words are general *Let them that be present*—and then—*let one of them*—do so and so—*i. e.* baptize it. I will not trouble the Reader with Proving this at large, in this place; both *Doctor* and *Student* agree, that in this Rubric *Lay-Baptism* was supposed and allow'd, but that it is now well mended: instead of *one of them*, it is now *the lawful Minister*. See the Doctor's Letter to the Author of *Lay-Baptism* invalid, pag. 24. and the Author, pag. 112.

The *second Question* is asked for the Satisfaction of the Minister and the Congregation. For Witnesses are not essentially necessary to Baptism, but the Minister cannot be sure the Child was before baptized, unless it be attested by Witnesses.

The *third Question* may be answer'd by saying Nothing, and the Baptism would not be at all affected by it. For though People should and ought to call upon God for Grace and Succour, in that and all other Cases of Necessity, yet if they should omit or forget to do so, through Haste, and Fright, and Hurry, the Child might, notwithstanding that, be rightly baptized. But to call upon God *for Grace*, is, in this place, to say the *Lords-Prayer*; as is also evident from the *Catechism* in the Words of the *Catechist* just before that Prayer. And no body will affirm that the *Lords-Prayer*, or any other Prayer, is so *Essential* to Baptism, as to make it *invalid*, if omitted.

The *fourth* and *fifth Questions* must be positively answered—*With Water*; and *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*:

Or

Or else the Child must be unavoidably baptized again. *The Matter and Form* are so essential, that there is no true Baptism without them.

The *sixth* Question to the People who bring the Child to Church, after it has been thus baptized in Private, is—*Whether they think the Child to be lawfully and perfectly baptized?* To which I suppose the Answer may well be, *Yes.*

Does it not therefore follow, both from the Question and the Answer, that a Child baptized by a *Lay-Person*, in due *Matter and Form*, is *lawfully and perfectly* baptized? Does it not follow, I say, from *Edward VI's Common-Prayer Books*, that the *Church of England* then did so believe? I ask, at present, no more: But I think it will also follow clearly from hence, that *lawfully and perfectly*, were Words that did not then refer, to the *Administrator* of Baptism, but to the *Matter and Form*, and *Circumstantial Ceremonies* of it. And, because I may have little Credit and Authority with the Reader, I must tell him, that in the Notes printed by *Dr. Nichols*, at the End of his *Common-Prayer* (to whose great Care and Pains I own my self very much obliged, and so I believe would others if they would but read him) and which go under the Name of *Dr. Overal*, the Remark that is made upon the fourth, fifth, and sixth Questions, is this—*As the fourth and fifth Questions refer to the Substance of Baptism, so the sixth and last refers to the due Ceremonies and Circumstances that are to be used therein, and to be supplied in the Church, if through haste they were omitted at home.*  
And

And if the Author of the *Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, had better considered these things, he would have seen that this *sixth* Question was not quite so slight and needless as he makes it. He would have known, it may be, that *perfectly* was applied to the *Matter* and *Form*; and *lawfully* applied to the other Particulars required by the Law, in the *Rubrics*. And I think he would not have made the following Conclusion, as he does in Page 112. 'And therefore 'tis no wonder that the Church of England, upon a more exact Review of her Liturgy, expunged this Question (*i. e.* the *sixth*) out of the Rubric, and also for very weighty Reasons took away the Liberty of Lay-Baptizing in her present Liturgy, by requiring even in Cases of Necessity, that Baptism should be administered by the *Minister of the Parish, or any other lawful Minister that can be procured*. Which is a substantial Answer to all Objections that may be raised from her (*i. e.* the Church of England's) former Practice.

I set down this out of the Book, Page 112. which is also agreed to, as a good Conclusion, by the Dr. in *his Letter* to him, Page 25.

The Church did certainly leave out the *sixth* Question, but certainly not for the Reason assigned by these Writers, but probably, because she saw there was no Necessity for it, and not for any Mischief it did. She also left out the *third* Question, but neither these Writers nor I know *why*; but so it was, and I doubt not but for some good Reason or other. And, whether the Church did truly take away the

B

Liberty



Liberty of *Lay-Baptizing* in her present Liturgy, by requiring even in Cases of Necessity, that Baptism should be administred by *the Minister of the Parish*, or any other *lawful Minister* that can be procured — Whether the Church hath done this or not — I am now come to Consider. The Period of Time assigned for this Change and Reformation of the Rubric, is 1603, the 1st of King *James I.* in the Conference at *Hampton-Court*.

But before I come to it, I desire the Reader to remember, that I have been in Possession of my Point, from the Year 1548 to 1603, which is 55 Years. Which take in the Reigns of *Edward VI.*, *Queen Mary*, and *Queen Elizabeth*. In all this Time, *the Church of England* (whether Protestant or Popish) did never by any Publick Act of hers, make or declare *Lay-Baptism* to be *invalid*. Now I go on, to see whether she has condemned her former Practice or not.

As for the Account of the Conference held at *Hampton-Court*, between the *Bishops* and some of the *Puritanical Ministers*, before King *James I.* and all the Privy Council; I must at present be obliged to Mr. *Fuller* for it, in his *Church History*. Cent. xvii. Book ix. Page 8. The Conference began *January 14. 1603*.

*Private Baptism* (says the King in his Speech) is the third thing, wherein I would be satisfied, in the Common-Prayer. If call'd *Private* from the Place, I think it agreeable to the Use of the Primitive Church; but if termed *Private*, that any, besides a *lawful Minister*

‘ Minister, may baptize, I utterly dislike it.  
[And here (says the Historian) His Majesty  
grew somewhat earnest in his Expressions  
against the Baptizing by *Women* and *Laicks*.]  
Page 9.

‘ Arch-bishop of *Canterbury*, *Whitgift*.

‘ To the Point of *Private-Baptism*, the  
‘ Administration thereof by *Women* and *Lay-*  
‘ *Persons*, is not allowed in the Practice of the  
‘ Church, but enquired of and censured by  
‘ Bishops in their *Visitations*.

King *James*.

‘ The Words of the Book, (*i. e.* the Com-  
‘ mon-Prayer) cannot but intend a Permission  
‘ of *Women* and private Persons to baptize.

Bishop of *Worcester*, *Babington*.

‘ The doubtful Words may be  
‘ pressed to that Meaning; yet the  
‘ Compilers of the Book did not so  
‘ intend them, as appeareth by their  
‘ contrary Practice. But they pro-  
‘ pounded them ambiguously, be-  
‘ cause otherwise, perhaps, the Book  
‘ would not *then* have passed the  
‘ Parliament.

To this he  
cited the  
Testimony  
of the A.  
B. of York.

Bishop of *London*, *Bancroft*.

‘ Those Reverend Men intended?  
‘ not, by ambiguous Terms, to de-  
‘ ceive any; but thereby intended  
‘ a Permission of *private Persons* to  
‘ baptize, in *Case of Necessity*. This  
‘ is agreeable to the Practice of the  
‘ Antient Church. Acts 2. when  
‘ three Thousand being Baptized in a

Here he  
produced  
Letters of  
some of  
those first  
Compilers.

‘ Day, (which for the Apostles alone to do, was  
 ‘ at the least improbable) some being nei-  
 ‘ ther *Priests* nor *Bishops* must be presumed  
 ‘ employed therein. And some *Fathers* are  
 ‘ of the same Opinion. [Here he spake much  
 and earnestly of the *Necessity of Baptism*.]

King James.

‘ That in the *Acts* was an *Act extraordinary*,  
 ‘ and done before a Church was settled and  
 ‘ grounded; wherefore no sound Reasoning  
 ‘ thence to a Church stablished and flourishing.  
 ‘ I maintain the Necessity of Baptism, and  
 ‘ always thought the Place, John 3, 5, *Except*  
 ‘ *one be Born again of Water, &c.* was meant  
 ‘ thereof.

‘ It may seem strange to you, my Lords,  
 ‘ that I think you in *England* give too much to  
 ‘ Baptism, seeing, fourteen Months ago in  
 ‘ *Scotland*, I argued with *my Divines* there,  
 ‘ for attributing too little unto it: Insomuch  
 ‘ that a pert Minister asked me, if I thought  
 ‘ Baptism so Necessary, that, if omitted, the  
 ‘ Child should be damned? I answered No, but  
 ‘ if you call’d to baptize a Child, tho’ privately,  
 ‘ refuse to come, I think you shall be damned.

‘ But this Necessity of Baptism I so under-  
 ‘ stand, that it is *necessary* to be had, if *lawfully*  
 ‘ to be had, that is, ministred by *lawful Ministers*,  
 ‘ by whom alone, and no private Person, *in any*  
 ‘ *Case*, it may be administred. Though I utterly  
 ‘ dislike all *Rebaptization* on those whom *Women*  
 ‘ or *Laicks* have baptized.

Bishop



Bishop of Winton, Bilson.

‘ To deny private Persons to baptize, in  
‘ Case of Necessity, were to cross all Antiquity,  
‘ and the common Practice of the Church; it  
‘ being a Rule agreed on, amongst Divines, that  
‘ *the Minister is not of the Essence of the Sacrament.*  
King James.

‘ Tho he be not of the Essence of the Sacra-  
‘ ment, yet is he of the Essence of the right  
‘ and lawful Ministry thereof, according to  
‘ Christ’s Commission to his Disciples — Go,  
‘ *Preach and Baptize, &c.*

‘ The Result was this, to consult, whether  
‘ in the *Rubric of private Baptism*, which leaves  
‘ it indifferently to *All*, these Words, *Cu-  
‘ rate, or lawful Minister* may not be insert-  
‘ ed.

This is all that is left us of this Conference,  
with Relation to the Point in hand; and ac-  
cording to this Result, the *Rubric* was mended  
and the Words *lawful Minister* were inserted.  
But before I set down these Changes, I desire I  
may make a few Remarks on what passed in  
this part of the Conference.

I. From what Arch-bishop *Whitgift* says, it  
should seem that Baptism by *Lay-Persons* or  
*Women*, was not so allowed, as that it should be  
thought an indifferent thing whether a Child  
were baptized by a Lay-Person, or a lawful  
Minister. He says the Bishops in their  
Visitations *inquired* after such Baptisms, and  
*ensured them*. I make no doubt but what this  
Excellent Arch-bishop affirmed, was literally  
true. The Bishops might censure both the  
*Baptisms*, and the *Baptizers*, of this sort. But

does the Arch-bishop say, that such Baptisms were *invalid*? Did the Bishops then give Order to have such Children as had been baptized by *Women*, or *Lay-Persons*, baptized again, by a *lawful Minister*?

The good Arch-bishop had a Mind to say, that the Common-Prayer-Book did not so much as *permit* Women, or Lay-Persons, to baptize. But the King (and I think with great Reason) was perswaded of the Contrary, and therefore would have it mended,

II. Bishop Babington, who had been the Arch-bishop's Pupil, would not, after what the King had said, affirm that the Book did not intend to permit *Lay-Baptisms*, but that (however ambiguous the Words might be) the practice of the Bishops was, not to permit them; but to inquire after them, and censure them. But still this does not shew that he intended to say such censurable, and censured Baptisms, were *invalid*.

III. Dr. Bancroft the Bishop of London, tho' he saw, by the King's earnest way of speaking, to which side of the Question he inclined; yet very honestly and frankly defended the *first Reformers*; tells the King what they certainly intended, namely to permit *private Persons* to baptize; and the Reason withall why they intended this Permission, namely, because it was the Practice of the Antient Church, &c. And his speaking so much and earnestly of the *Necessity of Baptism*, is a plain Proof of his Judgment in the Matter, and of his Approbation of private Persons Baptizing; because the Practice of the Antient Church was indeed founded on their Opinion

Opinion of *the necessity* of Baptism in order to Salvation. This Bishop succeeded Dr. *Whitgift* in the See of *Cant.* (who died about six Weeks after, on *Feb. 29. 1603*) and was principally concerned in altering the *Rubric*, and putting in the Words *lawful Minister*. And yet I hope I may reasonably presume; that, altho' a *lawful Minister* be the proper and only allowed, only required, Administrator of Baptism, yet the Arch-bishop did not so far change his Mind, as to judge all Baptisms not administred by a *lawful Minister*, to be *invalid*. But of this, more by and by.

IV. I must leave it to the Reader to judge how satisfactory the King's Answer is to what the Bishop of *London* said, and indeed how consistent it is with it self. His Majesty declares that he maintains the *Necessity of Baptism*, and that he always thought the Place of *St. John 3. 5.* to be meant thereof; but then he is pleased to say, that he only means it to be *necessary*, where it can be had at the Hands of a *lawful Minister*; and that no *private Person* may administer Baptism, tho' in a Case of the extreamest Necessity. By which it should seem, that his Majesty put the *Necessity of Baptism* upon the same foot, with the *Necessity of Receiving the other Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*; which few People have ever judg'd so necessary to be received, as to call for it, or take it from an improper, unauthorized, unconsecrated Hand; no not even those who believed that Infants (upon the Peril of their Souls) were to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Necessity of



Baptism maintained by the King, is so little urgent, that he thinks the Infant may as well die *unbaptized*, as baptized by an *unlawful* Hand. My Undertaking does not oblige me to dispute against the King's Opinion (which is contrary to that of the antient Church) but to shew what I think it was. But mark the Inconsistency of it. He is utterly against *Re-baptizing* such as had been before baptized by *Laicks*. But is not this to allow their Baptism to be valid? And is it as well for a Child to die *unbaptized*, as baptized by a *Latek*, whose Baptism must not be reiterated? If Lay-Baptism be invalid, how can it possibly consist with the Belief of the Necessity of Baptism, to deny the Re-baptizing Infants so baptized? Men may make *Premises* if they will, but *Consequences* make themselves. If Baptism be absolutely necessary from a *lawful hand*, and a *Lay hand* be not a lawful Hand, then *Lay-Baptism* is not the Baptism that is absolutely necessary: It must therefore be had from a Hand that is *lawful*. If therefore the King will not, by any means, allow of *Rebaptizing* such as were baptized by *Lay-hands*, other Folks will infer, for him, either that such Baptism is *valid*, or that Baptism is not absolutely necessary. Thus far, however, the King is clear in, that such as were baptized by *Laicks*, must not be *re-baptized*: And therefore the *Rubric* (as far as the King is concern'd in it) that makes the Administrator of Baptism to be a *lawful Minister* only, does not necessarily infer the *Re-baptizing* of such as were not baptized by a lawful Minister. I shall only add, in this place, that

that the *Ministers* whom King *James* mentions, and whom he calls *his Divines*, were *Presbyterians*, and of *Presbyterian Ordination*: And therefore their Baptism was, according to the modern Dialect, but *Lay-Baptism*. But K. *James* did neither think so, nor say so.

V. Bishop *Bilson* is intirely of the same Opinion with Bishop *Bancroft*, and says it is a Rule agreed on amongst *Divines*, that the *Minister is not of the Essence of the Sacrament*. i. e. that if Baptism be conferr'd in the *Matter and Form* prescribed by Christ, it is effectual to all the Purposes of Baptism, let what Christian soever conferr, or administer it.

To this the King replies, that tho' the Minister be not of the Essence of the Sacrament, yet he is of the Essence of the right and lawful Ministry thereof, according to Christ's Commission — *Go preach and baptize, &c.* i. e. if I rightly understand it, that the Sacrament of Baptism cannot be rightly and lawfully administered, without a Minister commissioned by Christ to do it. Which is what his Majesty had said before, in Substance, to the Bishop of *London*.

No one can possibly imagine, that these two learned Bishops did not very well know, that those whom Christ commissions and sends to baptize, are the only Right and Lawful Administrators of Baptism; and that when such can be had, none else should undertake to baptize. But the Question now in hand was, whether Baptism was not so necessarily to be had, that, rather than the Child should dye without it, it might be administered by One who

who was not commissioned to do it, nor consequently had Authority given him to do it: And whether, when it was once administered and conferred by this unauthorized Hand, it was so valid as not to be repeated or reiterated again? this was the Question. The King was for having the Child baptized by none but by a lawful Commissioner: But in Case it had been baptized already by an uncommissioned Hand, he utterly disliked the Re-baptizing such a Child. The Bishops (with the best Antiquity) maintained, that the Necessity of the Case made the Administrator of Baptism (tho' in all respects besides an unlawful Hand) a lawful Minister, in this Performance; and were not for Re-baptizing any one who had been seriously baptized by any Christian with Water, and in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And thus the Matter stood between them.

These Remarks I thought might be for the Reader's Service, before he comes to consider the Changes made in the *Rubric*. And tho' he may easily perceive, that I am with the Bishops, against the King, in this Matter; yet I could not but think it fair, to let him see, that the *Rubric* was amended and changed according to the King's Pleasure; and that instead of that general, indetermined Expression of *One of them*, the Words *lawful Minister* were inserted, as they now stand.

After this manner then the *Rubric* was changed in 1604.



‘ First, let *the lawful Minister* and them 1624  
 ‘ that be present, call upon God for his Grace,  
 ‘ and say the Lords-Prayer, if the Time will  
 ‘ suffer: And then the Child being named  
 ‘ by some one that is present, the said *lawful*  
 ‘ *Minister* shall dip it in Water, or pour Water  
 ‘ upon it, saying these Words, *N. I baptize*  
 ‘ thee in the Name of the Father, and of the  
 ‘ Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

[In the Review of the Common-Prayer 1661  
 in 1661, this *Rubric* was thus changed, and  
 now stands—, ‘ First let *the Minister of the Pa-*  
 ‘ *rish*, or in his Absence, any other *lawful Mi-*  
 ‘ *nister* that can be procured, with them that  
 ‘ are present call upon God and say the Lords-  
 ‘ Prayer, and so many of the Collects appoint-  
 ‘ ed to be said before in the *Form of Publick*  
 ‘ *Baptism*, as the Time and present Exigence  
 ‘ will suffer. And then the Child being named  
 ‘ by some one that is present, the Minister  
 ‘ shall pour Water upon it, saying these Words,  
 ‘ *N. I baptize thee, &c.*]

‘ And let them not doubt but that the 160  
 ‘ Child so baptized, is lawfully and suffici-  
 ‘ ently baptized, and ought not to be bap-  
 ‘ tized again. *But* yet nevertheless, if the  
 ‘ Child which is after this sort baptized, do af-  
 ‘ terward live, it is expedient that it be brought  
 ‘ into the Church, to the Intent that if the  
 ‘ *Priest* or Minister of the same Parish did him-  
 ‘ self baptize that Child, the Congregation  
 ‘ may be certified of the true Form of Baptism,  
 ‘ by him privately before used

1661.

[ The Rubric is the same with the foregoing one, only the Words *But* and *Priest* are left out ; and after the Words *before used* is added, — ‘ In which Case he shall say thus, — I  
 ‘ certify you, that according to the due and pre-  
 ‘ scribed Order of the Church, *at such a time,*  
 ‘ and *at such a place,* before divers Witnesses, I  
 ‘ baptized this Child ]

1604  
and  
1661.

‘ Or if this Child were baptized by another lawful Minister, that then the Minister of the Parish, where the Child was born or Christned, shall examine and try, whether the Child be lawfully baptized or no.

‘ In which Case, if those who bring any Child to the Church do answer that the same Child is already baptized ; then shall the Minister examine them farther, saying,

1. ‘ *By whom* was this Child baptized ?
2. ‘ *Who was present* when this Child was baptized ?

‘ Because some things *essential* to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted through Fear, or Haste, in such Times of Extremity ; therefore I demand farther of you,

3. ‘ With what *Matter* was this Child baptized ?

4. ‘ With what *Words* was this Child baptized ?

The *first* thing I would observe, to the Reader, upon these Changes of the *Rubric*, is, that they were made by the King’s sole Authority and Command. They had neither *Act of Parliament*, nor *Act of Convocation*, to countenance them. This was a Stretch of Power, but because

cause it troubled no Body, it was easily submitted to. However, tho' the Alterations were very reasonable and *good*, yet they were not *legal*, till made so by the Legislative Power in 1661.

But, *Secondly*, taking them, as they now are, to be both good and obligatory, the Question is, Whether the Church of *England* does hereby declare, that *Lay-Baptism* is invalid? To which I reply,

1. The Church of *England* does certainly call for, and require a lawful Minister to be the Administrator of Baptism.

2. The Church of *England* does certainly (at least since 1661 or 1662) by a lawful Minister, mean and intend a Minister *Episcopally* ordained.

3. The Church of *England* neither allows, nor permits, any other than such as are *Episcopally* ordained, to administer Baptism.

4. The Church of *England* does hereby (implicitly at least) forbid any other than those of *Episcopal* Ordination, to baptize.

5. The Church of *England* inquires after, censures, and punishes (where she can) such as administer Baptism, if they are not qualified lawfully to do it.

But after all, I must own, that I do not think the Church of *England* does, by any, or all these *Rubrics*, intend to make or declare *Lay-Baptism* to be *invalid*. She calls for none but lawful Ministers; 'tis true; all Churches in the World do the same thing; it is not to be expected they should do otherwise. She does, by  
her



her Rubrics, *allow* or *permit* no other ; that is also certain ; Can any Church, by a *Rule*, allow a thing she thinks *irregular* ? Even the Rubric of *K. Edward's Book*, was so worded, as to leave it disputable and doubtful whether the Church allowed or intended to allow of *Lay-Baptism*, in Cases of Necessity ; inasmuch that Archbishop *Whitgift* and Bishop *Babington* contended that it did not *permit* such *Lay-Baptism*. And much less can it be expected that a *Rubric*, that was changed on Purpose to remove such Doubt, should *permit* or *allow* of *Lay-Baptism*. But none of these things do either in themselves *nullify* and *invalidate* *Lay-Baptism*, or signify that the Church does look upon it as *invalid*, when once it is administered or conferred by a *Lay-Hand*. For if it did, it would certainly and expressly order such Children to be *rebaptized*. Why should it not, since it maintains the Necessity of Baptism, where it can be had ? The Church of *Rome*, in all the *Rubrics* of its *Form of Baptism*, supposes the Administrator of that Sacrament to be always a proper and an authorized Person : It says in every Place, that *the Priest* is to do so and so, and *the Priest* is to say thus and thus ; and in none of its *publick Forms* does it allow or permit *any other* to officiate : And yet we know the Doctrine of that Church allows and approves of *Lay-Baptism*. We know that, in Fact, when a *Priest* is not present, that it allows a *Deacon* to baptize ; when a *Deacon* is not to be had, it allows a *Subdeacon* (which is as much in holy Orders as a Waterman upon the Thames)

*Thames*) to baptize; when a *Subdeacon* is not present, it allows a *Lay-Man* to baptize; when a *Lay-Man* is not there, it allows a *Woman* to do it; nay, if the *Lay-Man* be utterly ignorant of the *Form*, or *Words*, it allows the *Midwife* before him, to baptize the Child. This we know is the Doctrine, this we know is the Practice of the Church of *Rome*; and yet in all the Rubrics of its *Office of Baptism*, it only mentions the *Priest*, the *Sacerdos*; and it tells us, in none of them, that it permits or allows of *any other* but a *Sacerdos*. Who can expect it should? it is not a proper Place for it. And therefore I do not by any Means think it a conclusive way of arguing, to say the Church of *England* has, by its Rubrics, invalidated *Lay-Baptism*, because, by its Rubrics, it requires only a *lawful Minister* to baptize, and forbids all others to baptize, and blames, and condemns, and punishes such as baptize, who are not lawfully qualified to do so. This only signifies that she would not have it done; but it does not signify, that it is not *effectually* done, when it is *actually* done. For if it did, she must order it to be done again, if she judg'd it absolutely necessary to be done at all. I do not pretend to enter into the Merits of the Cause, nor to dispute whether *Lay-Baptism* be valid, or invalid; nor whether it be lawful or unlawful to rebaptize such as have been baptized by *Lay-Hands*. This is not at present my Undertaking: But my Aim is to shew, that the Church of *England* has not, by these *Rubrics*, declared *Lay-Baptism* to be invalid; or, (in other Words) that a lawful Minister,

nister, is so essential to the Validity of Baptism, that Baptism administered by a Lay-Hand is null and void. Nay, I am going about to try to shew the Reader, that the Church of *England* hath, in these very *Rubrics*, declared her Judgment to be, That (in the Words of Bishop *Bil-son*) *the Minister is not of the Essence of the Sacrament.*

The Way I take to do it is this.

When the Child that was privately baptized, is brought to the Church, in order to have the rest of the Ceremonies and Service performed and compleated, altho' it were baptized before, by a *lawful Minister*, yet is the Minister of the Parish, for his own Satisfaction and that of the Congregation, to ask these following Questions :

1. *By whom* was this Child baptized ?
2. *Who was present* when this Child was baptized ?

The Minister of the Parish is to know who was the *Administrator*, and who were *Witnesses* to the Baptism administered : He could not otherwise be assured the Child had been baptized. Now because these Questions are asked, in this place, as well as the two following ones, concerning the *Matter* and *Form*, it is concluded by some, that the Church of *England* looks upon the *lawful Minister* to be as *essential* to Baptism, as the *Water* and the *Words*. But if she does, how comes she to place so notable and distinguishing a Clause, betwixt the two first and the two last Questions, as this is ; —  
 ‘ Because some things *essential* to this Sacra-  
 ment



ment may happen to be omitted through Fear, or Haste, in such Times of Extremity, therefore I demand farther of you,

‘ 3. With what *Matter* was this Child baptized?

‘ 4. With what *Words* was this Child baptized?

Can any one read this Clause, thus inserted in the Middle of (and as if it were to part) these Questions, and believe the Church of England thought the *Administrator* and the *Witnesses* as *essential* as the *Matter* and the *Words*, to the conferring Baptism? Had the Church believed a lawful Minister to be as *essential* to the making a Baptism *valid*, as she did the *Matter* and the *Words*—she must and she would have said thus—‘ Because some things *essential* to this Sacrament may have been neglected or omitted, through Haste, or Fear, I must ask you—By *whom* was this Child Baptized, with *what Matter*, and *what Words* was it Baptized &c. *i. e.* was it baptized by a *lawful Minister*, and with the *Matter* and *Words* prescribed by Christ? But, to ask first—*by whom*? And secondly—*before whom*? And then to suspect some thing *essential* to Baptism might have been omitted, and to mention those *Essentials* in the third and fourth Questions, is, in my Opinion, to intimate that the two first Questions did not contain things *Essential* to Baptism. And that it may appear what Reason I have to think so, I desire the Reader to consider the following Rubric, which is the last in the Office of private Baptism—

C

‘ But

‘ But if they which bring the Infant to the  
 ‘ Church, do make such uncertain Answers, to  
 ‘ the Priest’s Questions, as that it cannot ap-  
 ‘ pear that the Child was baptized with *Water*,  
 ‘ *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and*  
 ‘ *of the Holy Ghost*, (which are *essential Parts* of  
 ‘ Baptism) then let the Priest baptize it, in the  
 ‘ Form before appointed for publick Baptism  
 ‘ of Infants, saving that at the dipping the  
 ‘ Child in the Font, he shall use this Form of  
 ‘ Words— *If thou art not already baptized, Now*  
 ‘ *I baptize thee, &c.*

Why does not the Church say here, *if it*  
*cannot appear that the Child was baptized by a*  
*lawful Minister*, let it be conditionally baptized.  
 Why does not the Church here tell us (and  
 could there be a fitter place to tell us?) that  
 a *lawful Minister* is *essential* to a valid Baptism.  
 When it is reckoning up the *essential Parts* of  
 Baptism, could it forget the *Minister*, if that  
 were also an *essential Part*? I am perswaded  
 neither could, nor would. And I therefore  
 think I have proved, that, in the Judgment of  
 the Church of *England* (what the *Bishop of*  
*Winchester* affirmed was a Rule agreed on  
 amongst Divines) *The Minister is not of the*  
*Essence of the Sacrament of Baptism.*

And thus I have gone through all the *Offices*  
 of *Baptism*, and the *Rubrics* that relate to this  
 Matter; and having considered them with all  
 the Care and Impartiality I could, I do not find  
 that the Church of *England* hath, in any of  
 them, declared Lay-Baptism to be invalid  
 and yet *they* are the *Places*, and the *publick Acts*  
 where one would look for and expect such a  
 Declaration, the most properly.

The *second Proof* of the general Proposition, is fetched from the Silence of the Church of *England* in this Particular. She hath in no publick Act of hers, ordered such as have been baptized by Lay-Hands to be *re-baptized* by a lawful Minister. I have already had Occasion to make this Observation in another place before. But it is, indeed, a clear and distinct Proof of the Judgment of the Church in this Matter. Had she been of the Mind, that Lay-Baptism was null, invalid, and ineffectual, her Care and Tenderneſs for all the People of this Kingdom, would have obliged her to command the Re-baptizing by lawful Ministers, all such as had not had a valid Baptism, if they could be brought to it. But she has no where intimated, no where suggested, much leſs expreſſed, or plainly ſignified, by ſuch Purpose, or Deſign to have it done. It may be ſaid, that from 1604 to 1661, the Church had either no *Occaſion*, or *Opportunity*, of declaring her Judgment in this Point; yet the World will acknowledge ſhe had *both*, in great degree, at the Time of the *Reſtoration* of King *Charles II.* when ſhe might very reaſonably ſuppoſe there were, in *England* and *Wales*, no fewer than two or three hundred thouſand ſouls, baptized by ſuch hands as are now called *Lay-Hands*, and were then eſteemed and held *lawful* and un-authorized Hands. May we not fairly enough compute, that Six Parts in Ten, of all the People of the Kingdom, who were fourteen or fifteen Years Old, when King *Charles II.* returned to his Throne, had been

C 2

baptized



baptized by such as the Church will not acknowledge for *lawful Ministers*? And what was there done with all this Number? What Care was taken by the Church to secure their Christianity? If the Church accounted them already to be validly baptized, the Question is given up. If she accounted their Baptism to be invalid, what Provision was there made, to have them *re-baptized*? I answer, none at all. And I say so with the greater Assurance, because I see that Dr. *Hicks*, tho' very able, and keenly edged to this purpose, hath not been so lucky as to produce one good Reason to make us believe that *the Office of Ministration of Baptism to such as are of riper Years*, was intended for such as had been *invalidly baptized by unlawful Ministers*; altho he thinks he has Reason to say it was. He does not, I own, affirm it, in any peremptory, magisterial Manner: But because he says it at all, and because his Authority (even in Matters of Conjecture) is much greater with those for whose sake I take these Pains, than I could wish it were, in Matters where I think he is much mistaken; because of this, I say it lies upon me, to consider what he has said upon this Point.

Thus then the Doctor speaks in *his Letter to the Author of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, p. 21

‘ You have well observed, *That our Church hath provided no Office of Confirmation for those who receive Baptism from Lay-Baptizers*. And indeed it would have been strange, that *she* which allows of no Baptism but by a *lawful Minister*, should have provided such an Office

to confirm or ratify the Baptism of those, who (truly speaking) were *sprinkled or washed*, but not *baptized*. But I think you might, with Reason enough, have farther observed, that *she hath* provided an Office for their true and lawful Baptism. I mean, Sir, *The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of riper Years*. This new Office was made presently after the *Restoration*, and is part of the *Liturgy* that now is confirmed by Act of Parliament; And I do not think it was intended only for *Heathens, Jews, and Mahometans*, who should be converted to Christianity, or for such converted Hereticks among us as reject Baptism; but also for those who had been *invalidly baptized*; of which there were great Numbers at the Time of the *Restoration*, and now alas, are many more. I submit this Observation to your Thoughts, and the Consideration of all who shall read it: And if my Opinion, as to this Office, is wrong, I hope my Error is pardonable, because it is not hurtful to the Church, nor casts the least Dishonour upon her learned and pious Bishops and Priests her Representatives, who made that Office, which before was wanting.

The Remarks I would make upon this Passage, are these.

i. I desire the Doctor and his *Friend*, to make little Inquiry into the Matter of Fact, and to examine, whether the Bishops after the *Restoration* in 1660, did not go about their several *Dioceses*, and *confirm* many Thousands of such as had been baptized by *unlawful Ministers*, and

not by the Form in the *Common-Prayer*? and whether they made, or tried to make, any Distinction between such young People, as had been baptized by *Orthodox* Ministers, and such as had been baptized by Men who were not *Episcopally ordained*? Did they declare or intimate that such as had been baptized by the *latter* were not baptized *lawfully*, and therefore could not be *confirmed*? Did they reject any one on this account? Or did they use any other Office of Confirmation, than the present one, to confirm all that were brought to them? I verily think that, upon Enquiry, it will be found, that not a single Bishop in the Kingdom, did then refuse to confirm any one, upon Pretence of their not being *lawfully baptized*, by a *lawful Minister*. Let the Doctor and his *Friend*, then, consider whether this Practice of the Bishops at that Time, be not an implicit Declaration of their Judgment, *First* That there was no need of a new Office of Confirmation, for such as had been baptized by Lay-Baptizers; and *Secondly*, That such as they confirmed were held by them to have been validly baptized. If a Bishop shall *confirm* a Thousand People, who (he knows, or might know) had been baptized by one that was not *Episcopally ordained*, with *the same Words and Ceremonies*, with which he confirms another Thousand People who had been baptized by an *Episcopal Minister*; will not every one conclude, that this Bishop thinks the Baptism of both these Thousands to be equally and alike *valid*, tho' neither *regularly*, nor *orderly*, nor *lawfully* at first conferred? Now whether



this was not the Practice of the Bishops at that Time, I leave to the Doctor and his Followers to inquire, remember, and consider.

2. I agree with the Doctor that it would have been a strange thing for the *Convocation* (had they been of his Mind) to have made a new Office of Confirmation for such as had been baptized by *Lay-Baptizers*. It had certainly been very absurd to *confirm* such People, as they thought had never been *validly* baptized. But is not the Conclusion as good on the other hand, that such as *were confirmed* by the *old Office* must needs be thought to be *validly* baptized, by such as confirmed them? *A. B.* was baptized in 1650, by a Minister of the *Presbyterian Ordination*; and *A. B.* was confirmed in 1662, by a Bishop of the Church of *England*, according to the *Office* appointed for that Purpose. Will not most People conclude, from hence, that the Bishop held the Baptism of *A. B.* to be *valid*? This I think is as plain, as if it were deduced from *Definitions, Axioms, and Propositions, &c.*

3. As to what the Doctor says, That he thinks the Church hath provided an Office for the true and lawful Baptism of such as had been *invalidly* baptized, it is very much to the Purpose, if he can make it good. It would utterly subvert the Objection that is in every body's Mouth, *viz.* That had the Church held the Baptism of *unlawful Ministers* (*i. e.* such as were not ordained by Episcopal Hands, and are consequently held as mere *Laicks*) to be null and *invalid*, she must and would have ordered all such People to be *rebaptized* by lawful Ministers. To

this the Doctor says, that the Church hath adjudged all such Baptisms to be *invalid*, and that such People were only *sprinkled* or *washed*, and not *baptized*, and hath provided a *new Office* for the true and lawful Baptism of them, namely, the *Ministration of Baptism for such as are of riper Years*. This Office he says was intended for such as had been *invalidly baptized*, as well as for *Heathens, Jews, Turks* and Hereticks. When I first read this Passage, I could not forbear repeating to my self, *How hard a Saying is this?* And it was not without Concern, that I remembered it came from a Man, now venerable for his Years, as well as for his Virtue, and his Learning. But with what Reason does he support this his Assertion, or Conjecture? Those he brings in this Place (as the Reader may see) are, that *this Office* was made *new* after the *Restoration*; and that, at *that Time*, there were many People who had been *invalidly baptized*. This Office was indeed *new*; but is it not rather to be wondred at, that there was not, long before this Time, a Form of Baptism for *adult Persons*, in a Church so well establish'd as ours was? My Guess is, that in the Days of *Edward VI. Q. Mary, Q. Elizabeth, and K. James*, and the greatest part of *K. Charles I.* there were very few People in *England*, that express'd any Dislike of *Infant-Baptism*; the Doctrine and the Custom was all in its Favour, and therefore there was no very visible need of a *Form* for baptizing People of *riper Years*. But in the Times of *Civil War, and Anarchy*, these wicked Tares grew up in great Plenty; and this part of *Anabap-*  
tism

tism, as well as the other of *Rebaptizing*, prevailed very much; so that betwixt the Years 1640 and 1660, there were a great many young People that had never been baptized at all; enough to justify the Wisdom of the Church in composing a *new Form*, that might serve for *them*, as well as all others whom the Doctor reckons up. This is but my Conjecture; but I dare say, the impartial Reader will incline to think, that the *Convocation*, which composed this *new Office*, had full as much Regard to *these* People, as to the *invalidly baptized*. The great Number of these last, is the *other Reason* which induces him to think that this new Office was intended for them. But, in my Opinion, this is taking the thing in Question, for granted. He supposes the Church to account all such as had been baptized by *unlawful Ministers*, to have been *invalidly baptized*; But has the Church made any such Declaration? I have been trying to prove (and I hope I have proved) that she has not. The Fundamental Mistake, I think, is this, that because the Church requires a *lawful Minister* to be the Administrator of Baptism, in her *Rubrics*; therefore she accounts all Baptisms not conferr'd by a lawful Minister, to be null and *invalid*. This is by no means a necessary Consequence: She has no where said so; and her Practice is clearly otherwise, as I have shewn, by the Bishops Confirmations in 1661 and since, and by her ordering none of them to be rebaptized. Which I still insist on, to be a good Proof, and which is not at all weakened by these two Reasons of the Doctor, of which  
I leave



I leave the Reader to judge. But it may be he is better provided, two or three Pages off; for there he resumes the same Argument, whether out of Confidence or Distrust of what was said before, I will not determine; but thus he says, *p. 24.*

‘ Sir, From these Observations [*viz.* that no new Office of Confirmation was provided for such as were baptized by Laicks; that the Office of Baptism for such as were of riper Years, was intended for such as had been invalidly baptized; that Baptism was absolutely necessary to Salvation, was an erroneous, tho’ innocent and pious, Opinion; and that such happy Alterations had been made in the Liturgy] ‘ From these Observations, Sir, I think I may conclude, *First*, That the *absolute indispensable* Necessity of Baptism is not the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. *Secondly*, That she approves of no Baptism, or thinks no Baptism duely and validly administred, but what is ministred by duely authorized and lawful Ministers, and consequently that she rejects all *Lay-Baptism*. *Thirdly*, That she cannot count those duely authorized and lawful Ministers, who take upon them the Ministry, within the Pale of her Jurisdiction, in Contempt of, and Opposition to, her Episcopat, and Episcopal Mission, or Power of Ordination; and by Consequence, that she must look upon Baptism administred by such Ministers, as null and void, from the Beginning.

‘ From these Conclusions, and the Consequences issuing from them, I have farther Reason to think, that the Office of *the Ministrati-*

‘ *on of Baptism to such as are of riper Years* was  
 ‘ intended for Persons *invalidly baptized* by such  
 ‘ *unlawful Ministers* among us, as were never  
 ‘ duly authorized, as well as for converted  
 ‘ *Heathens, Jews, Mahometans*, and such mo-  
 ‘ *dern Manicheans, and Seleucians* among us, as  
 ‘ held it unlawful to baptize with the Baptism  
 ‘ of the Church.

As I take this Passage to be but a Repetition of what he had said before, a little enlarged; so I acquaint my Reader, that I shall be constrained to repeat, in my Reply, a great deal of what I have before said.

1. Whether it be an erroneous Opinion, That Baptism is absolutely necessary to Salvation, is not proved by him, but affirm'd. Whether the indispensable Necessity of Baptism be the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, or be not, I am not able to determine, I acknowledge, with full Certainty. He who says that such an Opinion is erroneous, will say, among us, that it is not the Opinion of the Church of *England*: And I, who incline to think it is the Opinion of the Church of *England*, do so far think it not to be erroneous. And because I am perswaded that she does not hold *Lay-Baptism* to be *invalid*, I am also so far perswaded that she holds Baptism to be indispensably necessary, where it can possibly be had: She will have *Lay-Baptism*, in the want of a lawful Minister, rather than none at all.

2. I must repeat again, that it does not necessarily follow, that the Church *rejects* all *Lay-Baptism*, or accounts all Baptism conferred by Men not Episcopally ordained, to be *null* and *invalid*,

See

P. 18.

*valid*, because she does in all her Offices and Rubrics call for and require a *lawful Minister* to conferr Baptism. This, the Doctor knows, is not a certain Consequence in the Church of *Rome*, which in her Office of Baptism requires a *Priest*, a *Sacerdos* only, to administer that Sacrament. And I would ask him, if he thinks that the Church of *England*, when she changed her *Rubric* in 1603, from those indefinite Words — *Let one of them*—into — a *Lawful Minister*, whether she did thereby intend to *invalidate* and utterly *annull* all Baptisms that had been before conferr'd by *Lay-Hands*? or whether she baptized again, by a lawful Minister, such *Lay-baptized*? What if I should acquaint the Doctor, that in all the *Offices of Baptism*, whether *Publick* or *Private*, that of *Infants*, or that of *adult* and grown-up Persons, there is not so much as the Word *Deacon* to be found in them throughout? and that both *Minister* and *Curate*, which are used in them, do signify a *Priest*, and nothing but a *Priest*. This I assure him, is Matter of Fact, and exactly true, as he will find upon Examination. Will he give me Leave to conclude from hence, that a *Deacon* may not baptize a Child, because he is not mentioned or required in any of these *Offices*, or their *Rubrics*? He will, it may be, say, that a *Deacon*, when he is ordained, has it in his Commission, to baptize *Infants in the Absence of the Priest*. I know he has; but let him go to that *Office*, and see if the Administrator of Baptism is not always to be a *Priest*, or *Minister*, or *Curate*, which, I say is but one and the same Man,



Man, *viz.* a *Priest* : And let him reconcile the *Rubric* which calls for a *Priest*, with his *Commission* of a *Deacon*, which allows him to baptize in the *Priest's* Absence. I would not be thought to make this a parallel Case, it is not exactly so ; but I would make this Use of it, that to insist too rigidly upon the *Letter* of the *Rubric*, when the *customary Practice* of the Church allows of Relaxations and Abatements, is to be over-wise, or over-scrupulous. The Church, in all her Rules, and Orders, must call for and require, what she thinks best, and would most gladly have ; but whilst she is made up of frail, imperfect Creatures, and subject to numberless Accidents, she must be content with the best Performances she can obtain. And, if she can secure the *Essentials* of Religion, will bear with the Want of many convenient and expedient *Circumstantials*, till it pleases God to make her easy with them also. The Church, in her *Rubric*, calls for a *lawful Minister* to baptize the Child ; and calls for no body else ; and would gladly have no body else ; but, in the Interim, another Person comes, call'd only by Necessity, or call'd perhaps through Fondness of the Parent, or through mistaken Judgment, but is by no means the Person call'd for and intended by the Church : However, he performs the Office, and baptizes the Child, in the same Element of Water, and with the same Words of Christ, who was the blessed Institutor of this Sacrament. The Church is offended at this Proceeding ; censures, blames, condemns, and punishes, the Intruder and Usurper on the Holy

Holy Office (unless it were in a Case of pure Necessity.) But after all, she sees the Sacrament *essentially* administred, the *Matter* and the *Words* of Christ were seriously used, and tho' the Voice and Hand that administred, were both unhallowed, yet will she not *invalidate*, or *disannull* this Work. The Doctor very well knows this was the way of reasoning in the Antient Church; and (because I have proved it) I am bold to say it is the way of reasoning in the present Church of *England*. And as she never has, so I believe she never will depart from that good Standard, in this Particular. The Laws, with very good Reason, have appropriated the Coinage of all the Money current in the Kingdom, to the *Prince*; and they have made it highly criminal for any Man else but such as are substituted and appointed by proper Officers, under the Regulation of the Crown, to have any Hand in the work of Coining: And the numberless Mischiefs that would ensue upon permitting every private Man to coin, if he could, do very well justify the restraining it to such and such elected and appointed Persons, and punishing, even with Death, all that transgress this Law, altho' the Pieces they coin should be of equal Weight and Fineness, with the *Standard*, and tho' the Image, Arms, and Supercription, should be as right and good, and to all appearance the same with those that were coined in the *Tower-Mint*, by the Queen's proper Officers. But yet these Pieces would be *current* still, the Prince would not *recoin* them, nor would the People *refuse* them; because of  
their

their intrinsic Worth, and their external Form. The Hand that made them might be deservedly cut off, but the Piece is *essentially* good; the *Weight* and *Fineness*, *Head* and *Arms* demonstrate it to be so.

3. Altho' the Church should not count the *Dissenting Ministers*, to be duely authorized and *lawful* Ministers, yet she need not, of *Consequence*, look upon Baptism administred by them, as *null* and *void* from the Beginning. This is begging the thing in Question, and not proving it. The Church may (tho' I do not take upon me to say she *does*, but supposing she *may*) count all the other Parts of the Ministration that are performed by Dissenting Ministers, to be null and void; yet it would not necessarily follow, that she should therefore count their *Baptisms* to be null and void. This is the single thing contended for. Abundance of People, I doubt, are easily led to think their Baptisms to be *invalid*, because they think if their Baptisms be allowed, the rest of their Ministerial Performances must be also valid. But this was held to be no Consequence by the Antient Church of Christ; nor is it a Consequence held by the Church of *England*. 'Tis *Baptism alone* that is not invalidated and made null, tho' conferred by an unlawful Minister, or a meer Lay-Christian. And therefore a hundred Passages cited either from the Antient or Modern Writers, to nullify and invalidate all the Ministerial Performances of unconsecrated and unlawful Ministers, are insignificant to the Point in Hand, unless they say expressly



presly that *Baptism* administred by such is *invalid*; which I dare say they will never be able to produce, provided they mean *Baptism* administred in the *Matter* and *Form* prescribed by *Christ*.

Upon the whole *Matter* therefore, I cannot see, that the *Observations* the *Doctor* has made are right, nor the *Conclusions* he has drawn from them to be just and good; nor Consequently can I find he has any manner of *Reason* to think, that *the Office of the Ministration of Baptism to such as be of riper Years*, was made and intended for such as had been *invalidly baptized*, by *unlawful Ministers*. And therefore I am still of the *Opinion*, that *the Church of England hath by no Act of hers, made or declared Lay-Baptism to be invalid*.

I. And I will add but one *Argument* more, 006 in *Proof* of this *Position*, and that shall be also fetched from the *Silence* of the *Preachers* and the *Writers* of the *Church of England* in this *Point*, from the *Year 1660* till the *Year 1700*.

Did any of my *Lords* the *Bishops* in their *primary Visitations*, after the *Restoration* of *King Charles II* (the *properest Season* certainly) give it in *Charge* to their *Clergy*, to inform their *People*, either by *Preaching*, or *Writing*, that such as had been *Baptized* by *unlawful Nonconforming, unepiscopal, Ministers*, were not *Christians*, having not been *validly Baptized*, and therefore that all such must be *baptized anew*? Does any one remember such *Instructions* given about that *Time*, or since? Did the *Writers* of  
Con-

Controversy who were many, and for many years, among other Points debated, did they, say, insist on the *Invalidity* of the Dissenters Baptism, in any of their Books? Did the *London—* or the *Country Ministers*, who were the most zealous to bring their People to Conformity, and a good liking of the Church-way, and to rescue them from Schism and Separation, and the Mischiefs of it, did they begin with this, that they must consider they were not *Christians*, and wanted *true Baptism*? Does any one call to mind, that any such Arguments as these were used to persuade their Flocks to enter into Christ's Fold, by the Gate of Baptism? Did they pretend to *convert* the Dissenters to *Christianity*? Or to *leave the Separation, and come over to the Church*? Is it not a very modern Thing, is it not of Yesterday, to hear it said, that *the dissenters are not Christians*, having been baptized with Water, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? And yet, will any reasonable Man tell us, that it was not the Duty of the Bishops to have given these things in Charge to the Clergy? Will any one say, it was not the proper business of the controversial Writers, to have insisted mainly on this great Point? Or could the Parish-Priests have done any thing better, more pleasing to God, or more useful to the people, than to have told them, they must *become Christians and be Baptized*? Was there any Neglect of this great Duty among all sorts of Parties concerned, at a Time when nothing could have been more proper? Who can easily come into this Belief? If this Silence of the

Ecclesiastical Governours, of the Parish-Priests and of the Writers of Controversy, be not a Proof of the Church of *England's* Judgment in the Matter; I must despair of knowing what can be one.

And thus I have gone through the little Work I undertook: Which was not to prove the Validity of Lay-Baptism; nor to prove the Baptism of Dissenters to be good and valid, in Opposition to the Author of *Lay-Baptism's Invalidity*, or in Opposition to Dr. *Hicks* his Abetter and Encourager; this was not my Design; but to make good my Position—*That the Church of England hath, by no publick Act of hers, made or declared Lay-Baptism to be invalid.* Both those Writers had affirm'd that the Church of *England* accounted Lay-Baptism, and the Baptism of Dissenting Ministers, to be *invalid*; as far as they affirm that, I have concerned my self with them, and no farther. But because I could not disprove their Allegations in this particular, without discovering my Opinion in the general, of the Matter in dispute, every Body will see I am of a very different Judgment from those Writers. The only thing I would leave with the Reader is to consider, whether I have not made good my Position, from the particular Proofs I have brought; from the Consideration of the *Offices of Baptism* and their *Rubrics*; from the *Confirmations* of the Bishops after 1660; and from the *Silence* of the Clergy, and Church-Writers, for upwards of Forty Years, in a Matter where every Body will see they were highly concerned to have spoken. And if *the Church of England*



was not declared *Lay-Baptism*, and *Dissenters Baptism*, to be *invalid*, I cannot choose but think it a very great Presumption for any private Member of her Communion, to do so. As for what the Author of the aforesaid Book, says of the 23d and 26th *Articles*; he may know that those *Articles* were made in 1552 (as well as 1562) by many of the same People who made the Office of Baptism and Rubrics in 1548 and 1552: And that therefore the Allowance of Lay-baptism, was not thought to clash, or be inconsistent with those *Articles*. But he may also know, that the Church by requiring a *lawful Minister* to Baptism, does not, by necessary consequence, invalidate a Baptism conferred by an *unlawful Minister*. The Reader will, I hope, be content, that, in Affirmance of my position, I present him with some Citations, out of Mr. *Hooker*, and Mr. *Thorndike*; the one before, the other since the Change made in 1603.



# Appendix.

**T**HE famous *Tho. Cartwright*, Lib. i. Page 143. Saith ‘ that private Baptism first  
 ‘ rose upon a false Interpretation of *St. John*, 3.  
 ‘ *Unless a Man be born again of Water and of the*  
 ‘ *Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*  
 ‘ Where certain do interpret the word *Water*  
 ‘ for the material and elemental *Water*; when  
 ‘ as our Saviour *Christ* taketh *Water* there, but  
 ‘ a borrowed Speech for the *Spirit of God*, the  
 ‘ Effect whereof it shaddoweth out.

To this, Mr. *Richard Hooker*, Lib. v. §. 59. replies—

‘ To hide the general consent of Antiquity  
 ‘ agreeing in the literal Interpretation, the  
 ‘ cunningly affirm, that *certain* have taken  
 ‘ these Words, as meant of material *Water*  
 ‘ when they know that of *all the Antients* there  
 ‘ is *not one* to be named, that ever did otherwise  
 ‘ wise either expound or alledge that Place  
 ‘ than as implying external Baptism.

‘ *Tho. Cartwright*, Lib. i. 146. The Orders  
 ‘ which God hath set are, that it should  
 ‘ done *in the Congregation, and by the Minister*  
 ‘ And I will further say, that altho’ the

‘ far

‘fants which dye without Baptism, should be assuredly *damned* (which is most false) yet ought not the Orders, which God hath set in his Church, be broken after this sort.

To this Mr. *Hooker* replies at large, Lib. v. §. 61. but I will only set down a few Lines.

‘To acknowledge Christ’s Institution to be the ground of both Sacraments, I suppose no Christian Man will refuse: For it giveth them their very Nature, it appointeth *the Matter* whereof they consist; the *Form* of their Administration it teacheth; and it blesteth them with that *Grace*, whereby they are to us, both Pledges and Instruments of Life. Nevertheless, seeing Christ’s Institution containeth, besides that which maketh compleat the Essence or Nature, *other things* that are only Parts, as it were, of the Furniture of Sacraments; the difference between these two must unfold that which the general Terms of indefinite Speech would confound. [I assure the Reader, that Mr. *Hooker* was of Bishop *Bilson*’s Mind, that *the Minister was not of the Essence of Baptism.*]

T. C. Lib. 1. Page 144.

‘On this Point, whether *he be a Minister* or no, dependeth not only the *Dignity*, but the *Being* of the Sacrament. So that I take the Baptism of *Women*, to be no more the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, than any other daily or ordinary *washing* of the Child.

Mr. *Hooker*, Lib. v. §. 62. which I desire the Reader to look carefully over, if he has the book by him. I only transcribe some Parts of



it, for the sake of those who have it not. And little could any body have thought, that the Arguments which *Thomas Cartwright* a principal *Puritan Minister* produced above an hundred Years ago, against the *Doctrine, Practice, Service, and Ministers* of the Church of *England*, in the Point of *Lay-Baptism*; should now be again produced by Doctor *H—s*, and several Church of *England* Ministers, against the *Dissenting Ministers*, to prove their Baptism to be *Lay-Baptism*, and altogether *invalid, null, and void*; *sprinkling, and washing*, if you will but not *baptizing* any one. And that, at the same time, the Arguments of Mr. *Hooker* should be produced to prove their Baptisms *valid*. But we have lived to see strange Things: And if these Humours may go on, and be received encouraged, and applauded by the young Students and Divines, we may see stranger yet. But God forbid! Let this Digression be forgiven, and I go on.

Lib. v. §. 62. Page 231.

‘ The Reason whereupon they ground their  
 ‘ Opinion, *viz.* That Baptism by Women  
 ‘ no more a Sacrament, than any other ordi-  
 ‘ nary washing or bathing a Man’s Body,  
 ‘ such, as making Baptism by Women void  
 ‘ because Women are no Ministers in the  
 ‘ Church of God, must needs generally An-  
 ‘ nihilate the Baptism of all unto whom the  
 ‘ Conceit shall apply this Exception, whether  
 ‘ it be in regard of Sex, of Quality, of In-  
 ‘ sufficiency or whatsoever. For if want of calling  
 ‘ do frustrate Baptism, they that baptize with

out *calling*, do nothing, be they Women or Men.

Page 232. ' To Womens Baptism in Private, by Occasion of urgent Necessity, the Reasons that only concern ordinary Baptisms in Publick, are no just prejudice : Neither can we by force thereof disprove the Practice of those Churches, which (necessity requiring) allow Baptism in private, to be administred by Women. We may not from Laws that prohibit any thing with Restraint, conclude absolute and unlimited Prohibitions : Altho' we deny not but they which utterly forbid such Baptism, may have, perhaps, wherewith to justify their Orders against it. For, even things lawful are well prohibited, when there is fear least they make the way to unlawful more easy. And, it may be, the liberty of Baptism at such Times by Women, doth sometimes embolden the rasher sort to do it, where no such necessity is. But whether of Permission, *besides Law*, or in presumption *against Law*, they do it, is it thereby altogether *frustrate*, *void*, and as tho' it were never given ? They which have not at the first, their right Baptism, must of necessity be *rebaptized*, because the Law of Christ tyeth all Men to receive Baptism. *Iteration* of Baptism once given, hath been always thought a manifest Contempt of that antient apostolick Aphorism, *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism* : Baptism not only *One* in as much as it hath every where the *same Substance*, and offereth unto all Men *the same Grace* ; but *One* also, for that it ought not to be received by any one

‘ Man above *once*. [This Argument he pursues  
 in a convincing Manner ; and goes on to give  
 the History of Rebaptizing maintained by St.  
 Cyprian and the *African Church*, whom he af-  
 firms to have been mistaken : And makes this  
 wise Remark upon him — That *the Teacher’s*  
*Error is the People’s Trial, harder and heavier by so*  
*much to bear, as He is in Worth and Regard greater*  
*that perswadeth them*— And after a great deal said  
 on this Head, worthy, every Line of it, to be  
 thoughtfully perused by our new-fangled Mini-  
 sters, he says] ‘ Since the Church of God hath  
 ‘ always hitherto constantly maintained, that  
 ‘ to rebaptize them which are known to have  
 ‘ received true Baptism, is unlawful : That if  
 ‘ Baptism be seriously administred, in the same  
 ‘ Element, and with the same Form of Words,  
 ‘ which Christ’s Institution teacheth, there is  
 ‘ no other Defect in the World that can make it  
 ‘ frustrate, or deprive it of the Nature of a true  
 ‘ Sacrament : And lastly, That Baptism is only  
 ‘ then to be readministred, when the first Deli-  
 ‘ very thereof is void, in regard of the forealledg-  
 ‘ ed Imperfections, and no other : Shall we now  
 ‘ in the Case of Baptism, which having both  
 ‘ for *Matter and Form*, the Substance of Christ’s  
 ‘ Institution, is by a sort of Men voided for the  
 ‘ only Defect of Ecclesiastical Authority in the  
 ‘ Minister ; shall we, I say, think it enough,  
 ‘ that the Puritans blow away the Force thereof,  
 ‘ with the bare Strength of their very Breath,  
 ‘ by saying—— *We take such Baptisms to be*  
 ‘ *no more the Sacrament of Baptism, than any*  
 ‘ *other ordinary Bathing to be a Sacrament ?* It be-  
 ‘ hoveth



'hoveth generally all Sorts of Men, to keep  
 'themselves within the Limits of their own Vo-  
 'cation. And seeing God, from whom Mens se-  
 'veral Degrees and Præeminencies do proceed,  
 'hath appointed them in his Church, at whose  
 'Hands His Pleasure is, that we should receive  
 'both Baptism, and all other publick medicinal  
 'Helps of Soul, perhaps thereby the more to set-  
 'tle our Hearts, in the Love of our Ghostly Su-  
 'perieurs; they have small Cause to hope, that  
 'with Him their voluntary Services will be  
 'accepted, who thrust themselves into Functi-  
 'ons, either above their Capacity, or besides  
 'their Place, and overboldly intermeddle with  
 'Duties, whereof no Charge was ever given  
 'them: They that in any thing exceed the  
 'Compass of their own Order, do, as much as  
 'in them lieth, to dissolve that Order which is  
 'the Harmony of God's Church. Suppose  
 'therefore, that in these and the like Conside-  
 'rations, the Law did utterly prohibit Bap-  
 'tism to be administred by any other, than  
 'Persons thereunto solemnly consecrated, what  
 'Necessity soever happen; are not many things  
 'firm being done, altho, in Part, done other-  
 'wise than positive Rigor and Strictness did  
 'require? Nature, as much as is possible, in-  
 'clineth unto *Validities*, and Preservations: Dis-  
 'solutions, and *Nullities* of things done, are not  
 'only not favoured, but hated, when either urged  
 'without Cause, or extended beyond their Reach.  
 'If therefore at any Time it come to pass, that  
 'in teaching publickly or privately, in deliver-  
 'ing this blessed Sacrament of Regeneration,  
 'some

' some unsanctified Hand, contrary to Christs  
 ' supposed Ordinance, do intrude it self to exe-  
 ' cute that, whereunto the Laws of God, and his  
 ' Church have deputed *others*; which of these  
 ' two Opinions seemeth more agreeable with  
 ' Equity, *Ours* [of the Church of England]  
 ' that *disallow* what is done amiss, yet make  
 ' not the *Force* of the Word and Sacraments,  
 ' much less their *Nature* and very *Substance*, to  
 ' depend on the Minister's *Authority* and *Calling*,  
 ' or else *Theirs* [the *Puritans* heretofore, but  
 ' now Dr. H—s, and many young Clergymen's]  
 ' which defeat, disannull, and annihilate both,  
 ' in Respect of that *one* only personal Defect;  
 ' there being not any Law of God, which saith  
 ' that if the Minister be incompetent, his Word  
 ' shall be no Word, his Baptism no Baptism?

And p. 239 ' The Grace of Baptism cometh,  
 ' by Donation, from God alone: That God  
 ' hath committed the Ministry of Baptism un-  
 ' to special Men, it is for Order's sake in his  
 ' Church, and not to the end that their Autho-  
 ' rity might *give Being*, or *add Force* to the Sa-  
 ' crament it self. That Infants have right to  
 ' the Sacrament in Baptism we all acknow-  
 ' ledge. Charge them we cannot as guileful  
 ' and wrongful Possessors of that, whereunto they  
 ' have Right by the manifest Will of the Do-  
 ' nor, and are not Parties unto any Defect or  
 ' Disorder in the manner of receiving the same.  
 ' And if any such Disorder be, we have suffi-  
 ' ciently before declared, that *Delictum cum Ca-*  
 ' *pite semper ambulat*, Mens own Faults are  
 ' their own Harms.

And

And last of all. ' Whereas general and full  
 ' Consent of the godly-learned of all Ages, doth  
 ' make for Validity of Baptism; yea, albeit ad-  
 ' ministrated in private, and even by Women;  
 ' which kind of Baptism in Case of Necessity,  
 ' divers Reformed Churches do both allow and  
 ' defend; some others, which do not defend,  
 ' tolerate: Few, in Comparison, and they with-  
 ' out any just Cause, do utterly disannull and an-  
 ' nihilate: Surely however, through Defect on  
 ' either side, the Sacrament may be without  
 ' Fruit, as well in some Cases to him which  
 ' receiveth, as to him which giveth it; yet no  
 ' Disability of either part can so far make it  
 ' frustrate and without effect, as to deprive it of  
 ' the very Nature of true Baptism, having all  
 ' things else, which the Ordinance of Christ  
 ' requireth.

Mr. Thorndike in his *Rights of the Church in  
 a Christian State*. In the Year 1649. p. 107.  
 hath these Words.

' If the Charge of Baptizing given the Apostles,  
 ' had been meant of the *Office of Ministering*,  
 ' not of the *Power of granting it*, what  
 ' Reason could there be, that St. Peter, having  
 ' converted *Cornelius* and his Company, should  
 ' not baptize them in Person, but command  
 ' them to be baptized? *Acts* 10. 48.

' And if the Apostles employ their Deacon  
 ' St. Philip, to preach and to baptize, is it not by  
 ' Consequence, that the Governours of particular  
 ' Churches employ *their Deacons* about the same?  
 ' In the Synagogue it cannot be said that the  
 ' *Office of Circumcising* ever required any higher  
 ' Quality than that of a Person circumcised:

' And



And therefore in the Church, if there can be  
 any Question, whether a Person is to be ad-  
 mitted to Baptism or no, it is the chief Power  
 of the Church that must determine it. Or if  
 the Occasion require Solemnity, which may  
 argue him that officiates it, to be the Chief  
 in the Church, no *Deacon* nor *Presbyter* must  
 presume to do it before the Bishop. But be-  
 cause Baptism is the Gate, as well of the in-  
 visible Church, as of the visible: And because  
 the Occasions are many and divers which in-  
 danger the preventing of so necessary an Of-  
 fice by Death; in this Regard, the Practice  
 of the Primitive Church, alledged by *Tertul-  
 lian De Bapt. c. 18.* must not be condemned,  
 whereby Baptism given by him that is only  
*baptized*, is not only *valid* but *well done*.

Mr. *Thorndike* in his *Epilogue. 1659. p. 150.*  
 lib. 3.

When the Power of Confirming, proper to  
 the Bishop, evidenceth, that he alone *granteth*  
 Baptism (either by particular Appointment,  
 or by general Law, in which his Authority is  
 involved) but a *Lay-man* sometimes may mi-  
 nister it; we see what *St. Paul* means when  
 he says, *1 Cor. 1. 17. God sent me not to bap-  
 tize, but to preach the Gospel: Our Lord ha-  
 ving said, Matth. 28. 19. Go preach and make  
 Disciples of all Nations, baptizing them in the  
 Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: To  
 wit, that the Power of appointing it, not the  
 Ministry of doing it, is proper to the Apostles  
 and their Successors. Which Reason will hold  
 in sundry Particulars, concerning Ordination,*

con-

concerning *Absolution* and *Penance*, concern-  
 ing *Confirmation* and others. In all which this  
 being once secured, that no Man act beyond  
 the Power, which he receiveth, it will be no  
 Prejudice to the Unity of the Church, that  
 some Orders do that, by particular Commission  
 from their Superiors, which their Order in-  
 ables not all that are of it, to do. Because in  
 such Cases, it is not *Authority*, but *Ministry*  
 which they contribute.

*Idem.* lib. 3. p. 67.

But a great many Witnesses speak not so  
 much, as the *Law*, the *Rule*, the *Custom*, of  
 giving Baptism by any Man that was a *Christi-  
 an* in that Case of Necessity. (i. e. rather  
 than any one should dye unbaptized) For,  
 out of that Case of Necessity, the Office of  
 Baptizing belong'd to the very highest in the  
 Church; to wit, so as might stand with the  
 more weighty Employments of their Office:  
 For otherwise, a little common Sense would  
 serve to inform them, that those Offices which  
 required more of their Personal Knowledge,  
 Skill, Wisdom, and Goodness, were to be pre-  
 ferred before the Office of Baptizing; which,  
 tho' it concerns Salvation, yet requires no such  
 Qualities. Can any Man then imagine any  
 Reason, why all Christians are *licensed*, or  
 rather *commanded* to baptize in that Case, but  
 the *Necessity of the Office*? And that no Infant  
 should go out of the World unbaptized? And  
 this chokes all the Exception that is made  
 from the Custom of giving Infants the *Eucha-  
 rist*, in the antient Church. For, as I have  
 shew-

‘ shewed before that it was not held necessary  
 ‘ to Salvation, as Baptism was; so here I must  
 ‘ alledge, that it cannot be said, that the *Eu-*  
 ‘ *charist* was celebrated, and that all *Christians*  
 ‘ might celebrate the *Eucharist*, in this Case of  
 ‘ Necessity, to the Intent that Infants might  
 ‘ not go out of the World, either unbaptized,  
 ‘ or without the *Eucharist*.

Mr. Thorndike. *Just Weights and Measures*.  
 1662. p. 114.

‘ As for the Sacrament of Baptism; that, as  
 ‘ the Bishop only allows it, in any Case that  
 ‘ may be questionable; so the *Ministring* of it  
 ‘ may come to a *Deacon*, in the Priest’s Absence,  
 ‘ nay to a *Lay-Man*, rather than that any Child  
 ‘ should dye unbaptized.

9 NOV 3

**F I N I S.**

P. 44. L. 9. for *perswadeth*, read *misperwadeth*.